

February 21, 1978

Dear Harold,

Thanks for your letter of the 10th, and the enclosed Post clip.

I'm a bit exasperated too, since I have not seen quite a few of the documents cited in the AIB newsletter, which you asked about. In fact, I think I don't have any of the items you asked about. Sorry.

Thanks for the interesting packet of documents. I've given them PLH # 389-411. (List enclosed.) I ~~xxx~~ trust that if you want to send me any documents which are not to be further distributed, you will specify ~~xxx~~ to ~~me~~ ~~xx~~ that they are restricted.

Also enclosed are my notes on the HSC report, and on the ~~gx~~ Gale memo.

I just got your mailing of 2/17; thanks. I'll reply in detail soon. (I'm rather busy, since we are getting ready to move to another Berkeley address.)

Offhand, I'm pretty sure I've never ~~xxxx~~ the alleged 11/17/63 Walters telex ~~xxxx~~ (published in the Free Press), which you asked for. I don't trust Walters or Lane at all on any of this. I found it very typical of Lane that the Freep talked of how the Walters stuff was brought to Schweiker's attention, and that Schweiker later called for a full ~~xxxx~~ investigation, without ~~xxxxxxxx~~ mentioning that (as far as I recall) Schweiker never ~~xxxx~~ bought the Walters story. (Neither, thank goodness, did Edwards or anyone else.) Lane is really appalling. In his Mexico piece, either he is ~~xxx~~ being Machiavellian and intellectually dishonest, or he just doesn't understand the evidence. Or both. His break with the HSC is one of the ~~gx~~ signs that they may be culling out the junk.

Enclosed is the Gauthier memo Lane quoted (and you asked for) - 62-109060-2366.

With best regards,

*Paul*

PLH